

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are currently pending in the application. Claims 12-24 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 8-10, 25, 28-30, 34-36, 39, 41, 42, and 44-46 have been amended herein. No claims have been added or canceled. No new matter has been added by the various amendments. Accordingly, following the entry of this amendment, claims 1-11, and 25-47 will be at issue in the present application.

Claims 8, 25, 28-30, 34, 38-39, 42, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been amended to more clearly point out the claimed subject matter. Furthermore, claims 10 and 35 have been amended to correct obvious typographical errors. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 and 25-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is submitted that each of the claims 1-11, and 25-41, as variously amended, produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Each of the claims is directed to a listing of items in an electronic catalog, and various actions that may be taken on one or more of the items in the listing. The listing of items is thus modified in a manner that provides a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. In the event that the Examiner maintains the position that the claims do not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result, it is respectfully requested that specific examples be provided to support the Examiner's conclusion.

Claims 1-11 and 25-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,523,040 to Lo et al. (hereinafter referred to as "the '040 patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,306 to Bliss et al. (hereinafter referred to as "the '306 patent"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Discussion Of The Cited References

The '040 patent is directed to table compression that is performed in order to provide a display of a table that may be conveniently viewed on a viewing device. As discussed at column 2, lines 19-22, an output table is generated “having a reduced row/column count and/or format such that the output table is manageable for viewing on a plurality of viewing devices each having unique display capabilities.” Furthermore, column 2, lines 45-48 go on to state that “table summarization is only required when it is determined that one or more tables require compression of reduction to accommodate the viewing device.” Thus, the output provided to a particular viewing device is compressed, if required, prior to transmitting the output to the viewing device. This is further discussed with respect to meta-data that is defined for tables that sets out the pre-defined row and column reduction rules. For example, at column 4, lines 49-56, the '040 patent discusses table reduction performed by applying meta-data which are specific to each table and preferably stored with the object to be viewed. In the event that a particular user desires to have a unique display, the user must set up the display prior to viewing a table. As noted at column 5, lines 23-30, a proxy server receives an object and meta-data and takes into account “the viewing device’s capabilities/limitations and **possibly a user viewing preference in the situation where a user viewing preference was previously pre-registered with the proxy.**” (emphasis added). This is further supported by Figs 4 and 6, and the associated discussion, that clearly indicate that compression rules are predefined, and that table compression is performed prior to providing the table to a viewing device. Such pre-defined rules are illustrated in Figs. 9 and 11a.

The '306 patent is directed to grouping and manipulating items to provide views of groupings that may then be selected to display items that are in the grouping. More specifically, the '306 patent describes, at column 8 lines 21-26, a grouping box where different column headers that correspond to grouping fields may be dragged and dropped, with the items being grouped by the headers in the grouping box. Importantly, as illustrated in Fig. 6, different groupings are identified only by the header under which they are grouped. In the example, of Fig. 6, as described at column 9 lines 39-59, different items are grouped according to a “subject”

field. The examples provided in Figs. 6-15 illustrate that tasks may be placed in different groups, and the list of tasks within each group may be collapsed and expanded. The title of a particular group may be selected, and upon the collapse of the group, the title of the group is displayed. When the group is expanded, each of the tasks in the group is then displayed. The '306 patent further describes nesting of such groups illustrated in Figs. 12-15. Importantly, when a group is collapsed, only the title is displayed, with all of the items displayed when a group is expanded. In essence, the '306 patent provides a folder containing items in a similar manner as done in a hierarchal directory. When the folder is collapsed only the title is displayed, and when the folder is expended each of the items in the folder are displayed.

The Rejection of Claims 1-11

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out the claimed subject matter. With respect to independent claim 1, a method is claimed comprising: (a) displaying a list of items in an electronic catalog, each item corresponding to a row of the display, each row having values corresponding to attributes of the corresponding items arranged into attribute columns; (b) grouping some of the displayed items based on a selected attribute upon receiving a grouping command so that the grouped items are displayed in a single row having attributes corresponding to attributes of the of the grouped items and attribute values corresponding to the attribute values of the grouped items, wherein the grouping command is received after displaying the list of items; (c) expanding the grouped items upon receiving an expand command so that the grouped items are each displayed in a separate row; (d) removing a row corresponding to an item or to grouped items from the display upon receiving a row remove command; and (e) removing a column corresponding to an attribute of the items from the display upon receiving a column remove command.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation of the method as claimed. Particularly, neither of the references contain any teaching or suggestion of an electronic catalog. The method of claim 1 requires displaying a list of items in an electronic catalog, each item corresponding to a row of the display, each row having values corresponding to attributes of the corresponding items arranged into attribute columns. As previously mentioned, the '040 patent is directed to the display of objects, and such objects may

include tables. The tables are stored in a server, and are viewed using a viewing device. Importantly, each of the objects is pre-defined and stored, with particular meta-data associated with each object that defines any table compression required. The '306 patent discusses grouping different tasks in a software application, and provides no discussion of electronic catalogs. It is noted that access to catalogs is generally performed when it is desired to select an item for purchase or requisition from the catalog, and thus it is desirable to identify items that are of interest based on attributes of the items in a display.

Further, the cited references do not contemplate grouping some of the displayed items based on a selected attribute upon receiving a grouping command so that the grouped items are displayed in a single row having attributes corresponding to attributes of the of the grouped items and attribute values corresponding to the attribute values of the grouped items, wherein the grouping command is received after displaying the list of items. Particularly, the '040 patent discloses displaying an object that may include a table, in which the table may be compressed according to a set of predefined rules. Importantly, the display is compressed prior to any display of the content of the table according to the predefined rules. As discussed above, in the event that a particular user desires a unique display, that user must have a viewing preference pre-registered with a proxy server, as noted at column 5, lines 23-30. The '306 patent is directed to grouping of items in groups for purposes of providing various groupings of items where, when the groups are collapsed, no additional detail related to the items of the group are displayed.

Because the cited references contain no teaching or suggestion of displaying items of an electronic catalog and grouping items as described, the references also contain on teaching or suggestion of expanding grouped items upon receiving an expand command so that the grouped items are each displayed in a separate row. Furthermore, the references provide no teaching or suggestion of removing a row corresponding to an item or to grouped items from the display upon receiving a row remove command; and removing a column corresponding to an attribute of the items from the display upon receiving a column remove command. Particularly, as discussed above, the '040 patent compresses tables based on pre-defined rules and provides for no removing of rows and/or columns from a display, and the '306 patent provides for grouping of items, but no removal of rows and/or columns from a display.

Therefore, it is submitted that the cited references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for a method as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references, and such disposition is respectfully requested. Furthermore, claims 2-11 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1 and it is submitted that each of these claims is also allowable for at least the same reasons as described with respect to claim 1. Each of the dependent claims may also be patentable for other reasons, and the right to assert any such reasons in the future is reserved.

The Rejection of Claims 25-35

Independent claim 25 has been amended to more particularly point out the claimed subject matter. With respect to independent claim 25, a method is claimed comprising: (a) searching an electronic catalog for items that meet a criteria identified in a received request; (b) displaying a list of items identified in the search; (c) displaying values for a plurality of attributes of each item; (d) receiving a selection of one of the displayed attributes; (e) consolidating at least two of the displayed items based on the selected attribute; and (f) displaying the consolidated items as a single item.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation of the method as claimed. Particularly, neither of the references contain any teaching or suggestion of an electronic catalog. Similarly as discussed above, the '040 patent is directed to the display of objects, that may include tables, that are stored in a server and viewed using a viewing device. Importantly, each of the objects is pre-defined and stored, with particular meta-data associated with each object that defines any table compression required. The '306 patent discusses grouping different tasks in a software application, and provides no discussion of electronic catalogs. It is noted that the cited references are completely devoid of any teaching related to electronic catalogs and thus provide no teaching or suggestion of searching an electronic catalog for items that meet a criteria identified in a received request and displaying a list of items identified in the search, as required by claim 25.

Further, the cited references do not contemplate displaying values for a plurality of attributes of each item; receiving a selection of one of the displayed attributes; consolidating at least two of the displayed items based on the selected attribute; and displaying the consolidated

items as a single item. Particularly, the '040 patent discloses displaying an object that may include a table, in which the table may be compressed according to a set of predefined rules. Importantly, the display is compressed prior to any display of the content of the table according to the predefined rules. Similarly as discussed above, in the event that a particular user desires a unique display, that user must have a viewing preference pre-registered with a proxy server. The '306 patent is directed to items placed in groups that may be manipulated in various manners. The items discussed in the '306 patent are various tasks or other items of a particular software program, and are not items that are not a list of items identified in a search of an electronic catalog.

Therefore, it is submitted that the cited references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for a method as claimed in claim 25. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 25 is allowable over the cited references, and such disposition is respectfully requested. Furthermore, claims 26-35 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 25 and it is submitted that each of these claims is also allowable for at least the same reasons as described with respect to claim 25. Each of the dependent claims may also be patentable for other reasons, and the right to assert any such reasons in the future is reserved.

The Rejection of Claims 36-41

Independent claim 36 has been amended to more particularly point out the claimed subject matter. With respect to independent claim 36, a machine-readable medium is claimed having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising: (a) searching an electronic catalog for items that meet a criteria identified in a received request; (b) displaying a list of items identified in the search; (c) displaying values for a plurality of attributes of each item; (d) receiving a selection of one of the displayed attributes; (e) consolidating at least two of the displayed items based on the selected attribute; and (f) displaying the consolidated items as a single item.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation of the method as claimed. Particularly, similarly as discussed above with respect to independent claim 25, neither of the references contain any teaching or suggestion of an electronic catalog or searching an electronic catalog. Therefore, it is submitted that the cited

references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for a method as claimed in claim 36. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 36 is allowable over the cited references, and such disposition is respectfully requested. Furthermore, claims 37-41 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 36 and it is submitted that each of these claims is also allowable for at least the same reasons as described with respect to claim 36. Each of the dependent claims may also be patentable for other reasons, and the right to assert any such reasons in the future is reserved.

The Rejection of Claims 42-47

Independent claim 42 has been amended to more particularly point out the claimed subject matter. With respect to independent claim 42, an apparatus is claimed, comprising: (a) a display to present a list of items and values for a plurality of attributes of each item, the list of items generated from an electronic catalog and corresponding to items identified in response to a received request; (b) a user interface to receive a selection of one of the displayed attributes; and (c) a processor to consolidate at least two of the displayed items based on the selected attribute for display as a single item.


It is respectfully submitted that the cited references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation of the apparatus as claimed. Similarly as discussed above with respect to independent claims 25 and 36, neither of the references contain any teaching or suggestion of an electronic catalog or displaying items generated from an electronic catalog. Therefore, it is submitted that the cited references provide no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for the apparatus as claimed in claim 42. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 42 is allowable over the cited references, and such disposition is respectfully requested. Furthermore, claims 43-47 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 42 and it is submitted that each of these claims is also allowable for at least the same reasons as described with respect to claim 42. Each of the dependent claims may also be patentable for other reasons, and the right to assert any such reasons in the future is reserved.

No claim related fees are believed to be due with this response. In the event any such fees are due, please debit Deposit Account 08-2623.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & HART LLP

By: 

Kenneth C. Winterton
Registration No. 48,040
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201-8749
(303) 473-2700, x2717

Date: Nov. 17, 2005

3385291_1.DOC